CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:

"Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450,
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450"
on May 18, 2004

RONALD A. KOATZ

Reg. No. 31,774

Attorney for Applicant(s)

UNITED STATES DEPT. OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

PATENT 01-R137-EDG J6705 (C)

Customer No.:

000201

In re application of:

Yang et al 10/085,721

Serial No.: Filed:

February 28, 2002

For:

PERFUME CONTAINING SURFACTANT COMPOSITIONS

HAVING PERFUME BURST WHEN DILUTED

Group:

1743

Examiner: Monique T. Cole Edgewater, New Jersey 07020

May 18, 2004

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is an amendment in the above-identified application.

[X] No additional fee is required.

The fee has been calculated as shown below.

CLAIMS AS AMENDED

	(2) * Claims Remaining After Amendment		(4)** Highest No. Previously Paid For	(5) Present Extra	(6) Rate	(7) Additional Fee
Total Claims		Minus			\$ 18.00	
Independent Claims		Minus			\$ 86.00	
Multiple Claims					\$ 290.00	
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT					\$	

^{*}If the entry in Column (2) is less than the entry in Column (4), write "0" in Column (5).

[] Charge \$_____ to Deposit Acct. #12-1155. Triplicate copies of this letter are enclosed.

[X] The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required to our deposit account No. 12-1155, including all required fees under

[X] 37 C.F.R. § 1.16;

[X] 37 C.F.R. § 1.17;

[X] 37 C.F.R. § 1.18.

Triplicate copies of this letter are enclosed.

RAK/sc (201) 840-2912 Ronald A. Koatz Attorney of Record Reg. #31,774

^{**}If the "Highest No. Previously Paid For" is less than "20," write "20" in this space.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mall in an envelope addressed to:

sistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

On May 18, 2004

Ronald A. Koatz ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

REGISTRATION NO. 31,774

PATENT

01-R137-EDG

J6705(C)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Yang et al

Serial No.:

10/085,721

Filed:

February 28, 2002

May 18, 2004

DATE OF SIGNATURE

For:

PERFUME CONTAINING SURFACTANT COMPOSITIONS

HAVING PERFUME BURST WHEN DILUTED

Group:

1743

Examiner:

Monique T. Cole

Edgewater, NJ 07020

May 18, 2004

RESPONSE TO COMMUNICATION MAILED MAY 6, 2004

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

In A Communication mailed May 6, 2004, the Examiner notes that applicants' reply which was filed March 1, 2004 (mailed February 26, 2004) did not address the 35 USC §112, second paragraph rejection of claim 6. Applicants are given one month to supply the needed omission or correction.

In reviewing the Listing of Claims submitted with the reply mailed on February 26, 2004 and comparing to the original filed claim 6, applicants note that what was marked as "original" for claim 6 in the February 26, 2004 reply is in fact different than the claim 6

found at page 41 of the original specification. Applicants are not sure why claim 6 does not match exactly claim 6 at page 41 (as should have been the case), but this appears to be a typographical error on applicants' part.

In this regard, applicants submit a new "Listing of Claims" reciting "A process for preparing a composition according to claim 1 yielding a maximum fragrance burst of at least 25%".

This claim (which was the intended claim) is firstly a process claim in agreement with all other process claims. Further, as it is dependent on claim1, it incorporates the limitations of claim 1. Importantly, this includes the amendment to claim 1 defining the meaning of fragrance burst (increase of perfume concentration in the headspace above fragrance or fragrance components). Claim 6 is dependent on claim 1 and narrows claim 1 only in requiring that the burst (as defined in claim 1) be at least 25% rather than 20%.

As such, it is believe that claim 6, like claim 1, now clearly overcomes the rejection under 35 USC §112, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

As noted, attached to this response is a revised copy of pages 3-8 (Amendment to the Claims and attached Listing of Claims).

In view of the attached, revised Listing of Claims, it is respectfully requested that the claims (i.e., all claims 1-11) now be allowed.

If a telephone conversation would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, applicants' undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone him at the number provided.

Ronald A. Koatz

Registration No. 31,774 Attorney for Applicants

RAK:sc 201-840-2912